

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is requested. While Applicants' recent response was deemed to overcome the prior rejection, a new grounds for rejection was raised. However, claims 10, 17-19 and 22 were deemed to contain allowable subject matter.

Consequently, Applicants have amended claim 15 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 10, while canceling claim 10. It is noted that this amendment does not include the limitation of the "cartridge" recited in previously amended parent claim 15. Following the prior amendment to add the "cartridge" limitation to claim 15, this claim was again rejected as unpatentable over the newly cited reference. The allowable subject matter of claim 10 is not related to the cartridge so it is believed that this limitation is not necessary for the patentability of newly amended claim 15. Applicants have presented a new claim 24 that depends from claim 15 and includes the cartridge limitation. Amended claim 15 is believed to be in condition for allowance, along with dependent claims 8, 11-14 and 16, and new dependent claim 24.

Applicants have further amended claim 17 to add the limitations of original claim 15 from which it had depended to the allowable subject matter recited in claim 17. As with amended claim 15, the "cartridge" limitation was not carried forward into amended claim 17. The allowable subject matter of claim 17 is independent of the "cartridge" limitation so it is believed that this limitation is not necessary to the patentability of now independent claim 17. Applicants have presented a new claim 25 that depends from claim 17 and includes the cartridge limitation. Claim 17 and with dependent claims 18 and 19, and new dependent claim 25, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicants have amended claim 22 to incorporate the limitations of base claim 15 and intervening claim 21 (which has been cancelled). The "cartridge" limitation from claim 15 has been included in amended claim 22 to provide antecedent basis for the allowable subject matter of that claim. Claim 23 has been amended to depend from now independent claim 22. Thus, claims 22 and 23 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is believed that the present application, including claims 8, 11-19 and 22-25, is in condition for allowance. Action toward that end is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael D. Beck

Michael D. Beck
Reg. No. 32, 722
Maginot, Moore & Beck, LLP
111 Monument Circle
Suite 3250
Indianapolis, IN 46204
mdbeck@maginot.com
317-638-2922